

**Minutes Committee on Performance-Based Compensation for Teachers**  
**October 12, 2004**  
**9:00am – 3:00pm**

**LBJ Building, Room 302**  
**650 West State Street**  
**Boise, ID**

Minutes Approved as corrected November 16, 2004

**Discussion on variable component**

Patty Toney gave her input regarding the variable model. She stressed that there should be multiple measures for the student growth measurement. There should also be a component for service and leadership.

Except for the bonus that is given for the National Board Certification, there is no bonus in the present structure.

**Discussion on the base salary component**

Reed passed out a model to use strictly as a **beginning point to generate discussion**. He stressed that the numbers and percentages on it meant nothing. They are there simply to enable the committee to look at the concept.

The number one factor is teacher effectiveness and statistics show that verbal cognitive ability relates to teacher effectiveness. Reed suggested the committee consider looking at the GRE evaluation for verbal cognitive ability as a component. Other items to consider: does the teacher have a Masters, is it a hard to hire subject, is the teacher coming to the job with 5+ years teaching experience?

How can base be increased? Possibilities discussed were:

Output – if school hits 90% growth.

What are possible predictors?

Sustainable salary increase possible for every teacher every three years

3 years rolling average – 3 consecutive exceptional rating - dovetails with variable component and with principal's review,

Score on GRE,

Successful professional development plan (using the work of MOST)

Patty Toney pointed out that the GRE is not required for Masters level. This would require another additional test along with the already required Praxis II.

**Discussion on principal evaluation**

Colleen said she has worked with principals that were good at giving evaluations and principals who did a poor job in their evaluations. The good ones tied the evaluation to student achievement.

Byron said that looking at student growth is essential and asked about testing in areas where there isn't a growth test. Also, the growth component needs to be tempered with what else is happening in a child's life. For a percentage we could look at NWEA for the projected norm growth that reflects the school goals.

Reed agreed and suggested we should look at where we can identify data for goals. Discussion centered on the ability of principals to do evaluation. Wendy said that the research shows the qualities that are needed. What are the instruments that measures what matters?

Teresa said that hopefully a good boss has the measurement tools that fairly evaluate his/her people. The 'good ol' boy network is present in private business as well as public. Everyone hopes to be evaluated fairly whether private or public.

Stan cautioned that quality evaluations take experience – and the evaluations need to be a consistent.

Byron asked about the 3-year salary review – what about support staff? Teresa said that maybe this committee should be developing a model that the districts could use and do the 'tweaking' to fit their own district. Do as Byron suggested – give the ingredients rather than the recipe.

Byron pointed out that education is changing from classroom to a systems approach. Example- speech and language pathology are part of reading. Reed reminded the committee of their efforts to promote collegiality.

Reed, going back to the principal piece, said the principal evaluation is a good thing but we have to have training in order to make it effective and reliable. Jack said that research shows that principals typically know what they are doing.

Byron added that training is essential and the district should be developing an evaluation tool that matches with the expectations of the district. Reed suggested that the districts would need some sort of clearly articulated scale and rubric with some general guidelines. Perhaps some from the Denver model could be used.

### **Presentation from Harvey Lyter, Interim Superintendent of the Idaho State School for the Deaf and the Blind.**

Mr. Lyter explained that ISDB is a state agency and the school has a merit-based pay system that follows state guidelines.

The evaluation process starts with the employee drafting his /her own evaluation. It is then passed on to the supervisor who edits and adds own narrative. The employee and supervisor meet to go over the evaluation. Any differences are addressed and the evaluation is sent by the supervisor to the superintendent.

When asked what his experience is with the ability of supervisors to evaluate. Mr. Lyter explained that the supervisors have the first hand knowledge of what their goals are and if

the performance of his/her teachers is meeting the goals. They are the ones that can assess if the performance of the employee meets the Position Description Qualifications (PDQ).

The question of the subjectivity of the supervisor review was presented. Mr. Lyter said that you need to rely on the professional integrity of the principal or supervisor. There is room for abuse in every system. Part of the superintendent's evaluation process is to pick up on that abuse. Ann Rydalch said she has seen this system work in business very well. The employee develops a plan according to his/her responsibilities and the supervisor works with the employee to ensure the plan is carried out. If necessary, corrections are developed to meet the plan.

### **Continued discussion on the base salary piece**

Reed pointed out that he wasn't committed to a mechanism that assesses for cognitive verbal ability. Stan explained that this is something that needs to be measured over time. Those skills need to be identified and grown. Teresa said she agreed with Stan. She doesn't think the GRE is a predictor to assess performance.

Reed asked if there are some predictors for success – something we can include in the salary structure?

Byron said Meridian uses the 'Perceiver' test. Byron will bring a copy to the next meeting.

Reed said we are looking for a probability factor for success. The committee needs to explore other predictors.

Teresa mentioned another component - the 'hard to hire' bonus, which should be given more weight for the subject area as well as geographical areas where it is hard to hire teachers.

Cliff reminded everyone to think about how we can use the items talked about on a statewide rollout.

Reed also reminded everyone that when there is a statewide rollout, the present system would be grand fathered in so that those who choose to do so could remain on the present system. As the committee goes forward with its work everyone needs to keep focused on student achievement.

### **Discussion on the variable component**

Cliff handed out a model that addressed percentages for the variable component. Discussion centered on the student growth piece. The multiple measures need to support the assessment for student achievement. Patty Toney stressed that there can't be just one measurement for student growth. Consideration was given to end of course assessments as well as ISAT. Reed pointed out that not having assessments that apply to every situation is not unique to teaching. You mitigate and manage for the variables.

Biannual parent survey to be moved to the biannual principal evaluation piece. The survey piece would remain under the domain of the principal with data required at the principal's discretion.

School improvement – individual student attendance and over-all school attendance  
Individual student academic growth – EOC aligned with Idaho Student Achievement Standards

Teachers need to be rewarded for collegiality and relationship building.

Teresa suggested that perhaps the committee look at some of what Mr. Lyter presented to apply to measuring those areas where there is not a test, like art, music and PE.

Byron asked what Reed's scenario would look like if applied to a teacher. Reed said that in a "best case scenario" a beginning teacher starting at \$27,500 after 3 years would be up to \$41,000, after 6 years s/he would be up to \$54,700 and there would be an additional 10% from the variable. He cautioned everyone to not put any stock into these figures at this time.

Patty expressed her concern about making the parent survey a statewide mandate because there are parents who will not consider answering a survey.

Wendy noted that a teacher getting zero responses back is as valuable as getting any. This is where conversation begins with the principal and teacher.

Byron said that engagement of the parents is very important. Reed agreed and at the state level we can't predict or mandate what it takes to get the parents involved. We can give them a starting point, then it is up to the teachers and principals to take it and develop it even more.

### **Discussion on Professional Development**

Patty Toney talked about the work MOST did on professional development. Reed asked her how professional development leads to student achievement.

#### **Professional Development**

- Domains of Professional Development
- State priorities ie reading, now AYP
- Knowledge & skills – advanced degree and/or more credits in teaching area
- School and District Plans
- Service and leadership – training mentors, mentors, peer coaches, work on school improvement plan

How do we get from an input model to output?

Reed asked what are the critical factors? What are the activities we want to encourage? The link must be clear from professional development to student achievement. We also

need to ask if a catalyst is necessary or are the results in student achievement what we are ultimately looking for.

**Homework**

Base piece – look more into the base component – remember student achievement is our goal.

What are the prediction factors? What are the predictors with the propensity for success increases?

Next meeting – November 16<sup>th</sup>